

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-38 are pending and rejected in the application. No claim has been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 14, 22, 30, and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-18, 21-28, 34 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. PG Pub. No. 2003/0110299 of Larsson, et al. ("Larsson").

Applicant hereby reserves the right to swear behind Larsson.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-38 include limitations that are not disclosed by Larsson. Specifically, independent claim 1 recites as follows:

1. A client comprising:
a memory having an application and a data structure stored therein, wherein the data structure identifies positions of the compressed codestream on a server and identifies data of the compressed codestream already buffered at the client, if any; and
a processor coupled to the memory to execute the application to generate a request for portions of the compressed codestream based on indications of which portions of the codestream are already stored in the memory as indicated by the data structure, wherein size of the requested portions is determined based on at least two of resolution, quality, size, and region of an image specified by a user of the client.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 includes limitations that a client maintains a data structure indicating which portions of a codestream are already received and stored within the client and which portions of the codestream are needed, in order to satisfy a user request for an image having certain characteristics, including at least two of resolution, quality, size, and region. In response, the client requests the needed portions of the codestream from the server and to integrate with the portions that have already been received previously to generate the final image to satisfy the user request. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from Larsson.

Although Larsson discloses request portions of the codestream from a server in CU (coded unit), it appears that such a CU has a fixed size (see Abstract of Larsson). In addition, there is no disclosure within Larsson that the size of CU is determined based on the characteristics specified by a user, including at least two of resolution, quality, size, and region of an image (e.g., variable size). Further, there is no disclosure within Larsson that a client maintains a data structure storing information indicating which portions of the codestream that have been and/or have not been received and stored in the client, where the client can only request the portions that have not been received and stored in the client to reduce amount of network traffic.

Rather, Larsson discloses that a client initially downloads an entire codestream. During the downloading, the client may determine that certain portions of the codestream are more important. The client then stops the full data transmission and requests only the certain portions of the codestream instead, using a restart marker (see paragraphs [0057] to [0059] of Larsson).

It is respectfully submitted that such approach is significantly different when the present invention as claimed. In order to anticipate a claim, each and every limitations of the claim must be taught by the cite reference. It is respectfully submitted that the limitations set forth above are absent from Larsson. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Larsson.

Similarly, independent claims 2, 14, 22, 30, and 34 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 14, 22, 30, and 34 are not anticipated by Larsson.

Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are not anticipated by Larsson.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsson in view of Guedalia (U.S. Patent 6,535,878). Guedalia discloses the user of a FlashPix protocol to provide image data to a client. However, such a protocol typically downloads fixed size blocks of data, instead of a various size blocks based on the characteristics of an image specified by a user. It is respectfully submitted that Guedalia also fails to disclose or suggest the limitations set forth above.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-11, 19-20, 29, 35-36, 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsson in view of Guedalia as applied to claims above, and further in view of Fukuhara, et al. (U.S. PG Pub No. 2001/0028404). Applicant hereby reserves the right to swear behind Fukuhara.

Although Fukuhara is related to encoding and decoding JPEG2000 image data, Fukuhara also fails to disclose transmitting portions of the codestream from a server to a client based on characteristics specified by a user of the client as set forth above.

In addition, there is no suggestion within Larsson, Guedalia, and Fukuhara to combine with one another. Even if they were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-38 are patentable over the cited references.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: September 29, 2005


Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8598